

Questions lodged by: Dr David Clark, MP for Dunedin North

To: Hon Stephen Joyce

Lodged: Thursday 3rd October 2013:

To: Joyce: Economic Development

12935: If a Crown Research Institute were to announce a restructuring that in his view was contrary to the national interest, what would he do?

Answer: It is not possible to provide the Member with a substantive response to a hypothetical question. If the Member wishes to ask me a specific question on an actual issue I would be able to provide a substantive answer. Furthermore, as Minister for Economic Development I hold no responsibility for Crown Research Institutes.

12936: Has he seen a business case relating to AgResearch's restructuring proposal; if so, how long is it?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

12937: Is it his view that a restructuring of AgResearch should be accompanied by a business case?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

12939: If a business case exists for the proposed restructuring at AgResearch, has he, or any of his officials had any input, or offered any advice on it?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13019: If a business case exists for the proposed restructuring at AgResearch, has he, or any of his officials had any input, or offered any advice on it?

Answer: Can I respectfully suggest to the member that he directs his question to the Minister of Science and Innovation, who I am sure will be happy to respond to his question

12938: Are there any circumstances under which such a major restructuring as that currently being undertaken by AgResearch would be reviewed by him; if so, what are those circumstances?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

12946: Has the Minister seen the AgResearch Change Management Team's report to the Executive Team on AgResearch's restructuring proposal?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

Lodged: Monday 7th October 2013

To: Joyce: Economic development

13245: Would the Minister consider an attrition rate of greater than 50% of AgResearch scientific staff at Invermay to be acceptable in implementation of the proposed restructure announced on 26 September 2013; if so why?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13246: What assurances, if any, has the Minister requested and received that historic restructuring attrition rates of over 70% of scientific staff will not be repeated in the current AgResearch restructure plan for Invermay?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13247: In light of the relative PBRF rankings of partnering universities, does the Minister accept it will be more difficult for AgResearch to attract and retain world-class scientific staff in the area of Genomics and Animal Productivity at its Lincoln campus if the current plan for restructuring these areas of science away from the Invermay campus proceeds; if not, why not?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13248: Is the Minister convinced that short or medium term GDP improvements will result from shifting scientists from AgResearch's Invermay campus to its Lincoln campus; and if so, why does he consider these benefits to be greater than those that would arise from the Change Management Team's alternative proposal?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13249: Is the Minister satisfied that the model used to predict GDP improvements from shifting scientists from AgResearch's Invermay campus to its Lincoln campus is robust?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13250: Is the Minister satisfied that \$13.4m transition costs referred to in the Business Case for the AgResearch restructuring are sufficient; if so, why?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13251: When does Tom Richardson's current contract as Chief Executive of AgResearch expire?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13252: What conflicts of interest have been declared by the AgResearch Board members in respect of the restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13253: Does the Minister have confidence in the Board of AgResearch?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13254: Does the Minister have confidence in the Chief Executive of AgResearch?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13255: What risk modelling of the Business Case for the AgResearch restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013 has been undertaken?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13256: How have risks and business costs been factored into the revenue and cost streams associated with Net Present Value calculations in the Business case for the AgResearch restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

Lodged: Monday 7th October 2013:

To: Joyce: Economic Development

13354: Did the Minister or any of his staff advise AgResearch in respect of their efforts to quantify economic benefits of collocating with others and/or clustering as might be inferred from p.11 of the Future Footprint Business Case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13257: Has the Minister read Blakeley, N., Lewis G., Mills, D (2005) The Economics of Knowledge: What Makes Ideas Special for Economic Growth?, New Zealand Treasury Policy Perspectives Paper 05/05?

Answer: I have not read this material in my capacity as Minister for Economic Development.

13355: Is the Minister satisfied with advice that a “robust and accepted method” to quantify economic benefits of collocating with others was not able to be identified for Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13259: With how many senior management staff at Otago University were conversations held in respect of the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13260: What was the nature of conversations with senior management staff at Otago University in respect of the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13356: Does the Minister consider the argument outlined under the heading ‘Economic Benefits of Improved Research Quality within AgResearch’ in the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012 sufficient to justify the proposed restructuring programme?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13258: What material has the Minister read, if any, in respect of John Kotter’s 8 step Process for Leading Change?

Answer: I have not read this material in my capacity as Minister for Economic Development

Lodged: Wednesday 8th October 2013:

To: Joyce: Economic Development

13404: Did the Government see the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd on or about 31 October 2012, and on what date did it respond?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13405: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the "well-established benefits derived from large innovation centres of excellence that create and deliver enduring outcomes", if so was the Government advised of such a centre of excellence in Dunedin comprised of Invermay, Otago University, AbacusBio, Pfizer and others?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13406: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding which of the company's major buildings on each campus are pre-1931, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and post 2000?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13407: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding which campus is the most, and least, modern overall?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13408: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the % of staff recruited from overseas broken down by campus?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13409: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding what the occupancy rate of Ruakura and Invermay would be after the implementation?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13410: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding whether AgResearch consulted Otago University, Deer Industry New Zealand, Federated Farmers or any meat company, given that they consulted Lincoln,

Massey, Plant & Food Research, Landcare research, DairyNZ, Beef & Lamb New Zealand and Fonterra?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13411: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the higher level of New Zealand co-authorship rates in Grasslands, Hopkirk and Lincoln compared with Invermay and Ruakura, which is the essence of the economic case, when international co-authorship rates were expressly not considered?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13412: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether co-authorship of deer science for example, might be affected if all AgResearch's deer science were to be done at Invermay; or if all New Zealand's deer science were to be done at Invermay or Otago University?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13423: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere, as to whether co-authorship rates included papers co-authored with private sector partners such as AbacusBio?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 13019 (2013).

13427: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether research quality might also be measured by criteria other than co-authorship rates such as the number of Royal Society Fellows, the number of publications in Nature Magazine, the number of recognised science awards for animal production or the so called H-Index for career citations?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 13019 (2013).

13413: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether AgResearch's assertion that "there is considerable evidence that proximity improves the performance of research and development activities because it improves the effectiveness of communication between researchers" might apply to the proximity between Invermay scientists and Otago University?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13414: Was he made aware of the outcome of the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint Proposal before it was made public, and was his concurrence sought?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

13415: Is he aware that the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal entailed the establishment of a Change Management Team (CMT); if so on what date did he first become aware of the CMT's findings?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 12935 (2013).

Lodged: Monday 14th October 2013:

To: Joyce: Science & Innovation

13485: Was he made aware of the outcome of the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint Proposal before it was made public, and was his concurrence sought?

Answer: I received a briefing regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint on 20 September 2013, which contained information regarding the staff consultation process. My agreement was not sought as the purpose of this consultation was to consult with staff, not the Minister.

13486: Is he aware that the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal entailed the establishment of a Change Management Team (CMT); if so on what date did he first become aware of the CMT's findings?

Answer: Yes, I had a teleconference with the AgResearch Chair and Chief Executive on 25 September to discuss the results of the staff consultation. I received a copy of the CMT report on 8 October.

Lodged: Monday 21st October 2013: DUE: 30/10/2013

To: Joyce: Science & Innovation

13806: If a Crown Research Institute were to announce a restructuring that in his view was contrary to the national interest, what would he do?

Answer: It is not possible to provide the Member with a substantive response to a hypothetical question. If the Member wishes to ask me a specific question on an actual issue I would be able to provide a substantive answer. However, the role of shareholding Ministers for Crown research institutes is set out in the CRI Toolkit. This is published at <http://www.msi.govt.nz/get-connected/crown-research-institutes/cri-toolkit/>.

13807: Has he seen a business case relating to AgResearch's restructuring proposal; if so, how long is it?

Answer: I regret to advise the member that I did not count the number of words.

13808: Is it his view that a restructuring of AgResearch should be accompanied by a business case?

Answer: Yes

13809: If a business case exists for the proposed restructuring at AgResearch, has he, or any of his officials had any input, or offered any advice on it?

Answer: I am advised that Officials from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and The Treasury provided information to AgResearch on what should be

contained in a business case for approval by shareholding Ministers. In addition, feedback was provided on the draft business case.

13810: Are there any circumstances under which such a major restructuring as that currently being undertaken by AgResearch would be reviewed by him; if so, what are those circumstances?

Answer: The role of shareholding Ministers for Crown research institutes is set out in the CRI Toolkit. This is published at <http://www.msi.govt.nz/get-connected/crown-research-institutes/cri-toolkit/>

13811: Has the Minister seen the AgResearch Change Management Team's report to the Executive Team on AgResearch's restructuring proposal?

Answer: I refer the Member to the latter part of my answer to Written Question 13486 (2013).

13812: Would the Minister consider an attrition rate of greater than 50% of AgResearch scientific staff at Invermay to be acceptable in implementation of the proposed restructure announced on 26 September 2013; if so why?

Answer: Attracting and retaining World-class scientific staff should remain a priority for AgResearch regardless of where it is located.

13813: What assurances, if any, has the Minister requested and received that historic restructuring attrition rates of over 70% of scientific staff will not be repeated in the current AgResearch restructure plan for Invermay?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13814: In light of the relative Performance Based Research Fund rankings of partnering universities, does the Minister accept it will be more difficult for AgResearch to attract and retain world-class scientific staff in the area of Genomics and Animal Productivity at its Lincoln campus if the current plan for restructuring these areas of science away from the Invermay campus proceeds; if not, why not?

Answer: Attracting and retaining World-class scientific staff should remain a priority for AgResearch regardless of where it is located.

13815: Is the Minister convinced that short or medium term GDP improvements will result from shifting scientists from AgResearch's Invermay campus to its Lincoln campus; and if so, why does he consider these benefits to be greater than those that would arise from the Change Management Team's alternative proposal?

Answer: I am advised that the proposed business case is designed to support the medium to long term performance of both AgResearch Limited and the wider primary sector.

13816: Is the Minister satisfied that the model used to predict GDP improvements from shifting scientists from AgResearch's Invermay campus to its Lincoln campus is robust?

Answer: I am advised that the model used to predict GDP benefits from improved research quality within AgResearch does not specifically calculate the GDP benefits of shifting scientists from AgResearch's Invermay campus to its Lincoln campus.

13817: Is the Minister satisfied that \$13.4m transition costs referred to in the Business Case for the AgResearch restructuring are sufficient; if so, why?

Answer: I am satisfied the \$13.4M cost is an estimate.

13818: When does Tom Richardson's current contract as Chief Executive of AgResearch expire?

Answer: I am advised that the employment agreement is not a fixed term agreement.

13819: What conflicts of interest have been declared by the AgResearch Board members in respect of the restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013?

Answer: I have been informed that no conflicts of interest have been declared by the AgResearch Board members in respect of the restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013.

13820: Does the Minister have confidence in the Board of AgResearch?

Answer: Yes

13821: Does the Minister have confidence in the Chief Executive of AgResearch?

Answer: The Chief Executive of AgResearch is approved by the Board of AgResearch, not the Minister.

13822: What risk modelling of the Business Case for the AgResearch restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013 has been undertaken?

Answer: I am advised that the business case includes financial scenarios that consider the timing and proceeds of asset sales, changes in interest rate and additional costs. In addition, AgResearch Limited has considered operating risks, the most important of which is staff attrition.

13823: How have risks and business costs been factored into the revenue and cost streams associated with Net Present Value calculations in the Business case for the AgResearch restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013?

Answer: : I am advised that the Net Present Value calculations in the Business case for the AgResearch restructuring proposal announced on 26 September 2013 factors in risks in revenue and cost streams by using conservative figures, building in contingencies and through the selection of the discount rate. Furthermore, scenarios have been provided that considers the timing and proceeds of asset sales, changes in interest rate and additional costs.

13824: Did the Minister or any of his staff advise AgResearch in respect of their efforts to quantify economic benefits of collocating with others and/or clustering as might be inferred from p.11 of the Future Footprint Business Case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: No

13825: Has the Minister read Blakeley, N., Lewis G., Mills, D (2005) The Economics of Knowledge: What Makes Ideas Special for Economic Growth?, New Zealand Treasury Policy Perspectives Paper 05/05?

Answer: In my capacity as Science & Innovation Minister, no.

13826: Is the Minister satisfied with advice that a “robust and accepted method” to quantify economic benefits of collocating with others was not able to be identified for Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I am satisfied that advice was accurate.

13827: With how many senior management staff at Otago University were conversations held in respect of the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I am not responsible for the content of conversations senior management staff at the University of Otago might have.

13828: What was the nature of conversations with senior management staff at Otago University in respect of the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012?

Answer: I am advised, positive

13829: Does the Minister consider the argument outlined under the heading ‘Economic Benefits of Improved Research Quality within AgResearch’ in the Future Footprint business case document submitted on 31 October 2012 sufficient to justify the proposed restructuring programme?

Answer: Any decision regarding restructure is ultimately a matter for the AgResearch Board. I have asked them to listen carefully to the views of key stakeholders and their staff when considering their plans

13830: What material has the Minister read, if any, in respect of John Kotter’s 8 step Process for Leading Change?

Answer: I confirm that I have read the ‘Future Footprint Business Case’ of AgResearch Ltd which applies the model in its Management Case.

13831: Did the Government see the ‘Future Footprint Business Case’ of AgResearch Ltd on or about 31 October 2012, and on what date did it respond?

Answer: Shareholding Ministers saw the ‘Future Footprint Business Case’ of AgResearch Ltd on 31 October 2012. Shareholding Ministers responded on 16 April 2013.

13832: During the period the Government considered the ‘Future Footprint Business Case’ of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the “well-established benefits derived from large innovation centres of excellence that create and deliver enduring outcomes”, if so was the Government advised of such a centre of excellence in Dunedin comprised of Invermay, Otago University, AbacusBio, Pfizer and others?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13833: During the period the Government considered the ‘Future Footprint Business Case’ of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding which of the company’s major buildings on each campus are pre-1931, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and post 2000?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13834: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding which campus is the most, and least, modern overall?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13835: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the % of staff recruited from overseas broken down by campus?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13836: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding what the occupancy rate of Ruakura and Invermay would be after the implementation?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13837: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding whether AgResearch consulted Otago University, Deer Industry New Zealand, Federated Farmers or any meat company, given that they consulted Lincoln, Massey, Plant & Food Research, Landcare research, DairyNZ, Beef & Lamb New Zealand and Fonterra?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13838: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere regarding the higher level of New Zealand co-authorship rates in Grasslands, Hopkirk and Lincoln compared with Invermay and Ruakura, which is the essence of the economic case, when international co-authorship rates were expressly not considered?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13839: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether co-authorship of deer science for example, might be affected if all AgResearch's deer science were to be done at Invermay; or if all New Zealand's deer science were to be done at Invermay or Otago University?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13840: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere, as to whether co-authorship rates included papers co-authored with private sector partners such as AbacusBio?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13841: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether research quality might also be measured by criteria other than co-authorship rates such as the number of Royal Society Fellows, the number of publications in Nature Magazine, the number of recognised science awards for animal production or the so called H-Index for career citations?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13842 (2013).

13842: During the period the Government considered the 'Future Footprint Business Case' of AgResearch Ltd did it seek any further information from the company, officials or elsewhere as to whether AgResearch's assertion that "there is considerable evidence that proximity improves the performance of research and development activities because it improves the effectiveness of communication between researchers" might apply to the proximity between Invermay scientists and Otago University?

Answer: I have had a number of discussions regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint since it was provided to Ministers. I have sought additional advice on a range of matters relating to the proposal from the AgResearch Board, Officials, and others.

13843: Was he made aware of the outcome of the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint Proposal before it was made public, and was his concurrence sought?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13485 (2013).

13844: Is he aware that the staff consultation process regarding AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal entailed the establishment of a Change Management Team (CMT); if so on what date did he first become aware of the CMT's findings?

Answer: Text: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 13486 (2013).

Lodged: Monday 11th November 2013: DUE: 19/11/2013

To: Joyce: Science & Innovation

14640: With respect to his answer to WPQ 13485 was the briefing that he received on AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal the first such briefing he received; if not, on what date or dates did he receive earlier briefings, from whom?

Answer: Prior to 20 September 2013, I received briefings on AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal from the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment on 12 December 2012, 20 December 2012 and 19 March 2013.

14641: Has AgResearch at any stage sought his approval, concurrence, permission or similar to proceed with the development of its Future Footprint proposal; if so what did they seek, when?

Answer: Answer Text: AgResearch sought approval to proceed with the development of its Future Footprint proposal when the business case was first submitted.

14642: Is he requiring AgResearch to seek shareholder approval, concurrence, permission or similar to proceed with the implementation of its Future Footprint proposal; if so does he anticipate an approach this calendar year?

Answer: The authority to make decisions regarding AgResearch's future rests with its Board of Directors. I will continue to test AgResearch's proposals thoroughly as their plans continue to evolve

14643: Is he requiring AgResearch to seek shareholder approval, concurrence, permission or similar to proceed with the implementation of its Future Footprint proposal; if so does he anticipate an approach this financial year?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 14642 (2013).

14644: With respect to his answer to WPQ 13809 has he received any written advice from officials regarding AgResearch's business case; if so on which date or dates has that advice been received?

Answer: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 14640 (2013).

14645: With respect to his answer to WPQ 13485 what subjects other than the staff consultation process, if any, were covered in his briefing of September 20th?

Answer: The briefing of 20 September 2013 contained detail on risks and risk management pertaining to the Future Footprint proposal.

14646: With respect to his answer to WPQ 13486 has he received any written advice from officials regarding the report of AgResearch's Change Management Team [CMT]; if so on what date or dates has that advice been received?

Answer: I was briefed by the Chair and Chief Executive of AgResearch on this matter.

14647: With respect to his answer to WPQ 13486 on what dates has he had a meeting or teleconference with the Chair and/or Chief Executive of AgResearch other than September 25th?

Answer: I have met with the Chair and/or Chief Executive of AgResearch on numerous occasions since becoming the Minister of Science and Innovation.

14808: Is he requiring AgResearch to seek shareholder approval, concurrence, permission or similar to proceed with the implementation of its Future Footprint proposal; if not, when does he anticipate an approach?

Answer: Text: I refer the Member to my answer to Written Question 14642 (2013).

Lodged: Monday 18th November 2013: DUE: 26/11/2013

To: Joyce: Science & Innovation

15237: Has he referred, or does he intend to refer, the analysis by Business and Economic Research Ltd of AgResearch's Future Footprint Business case to his officials for comment; if so when does he expect to receive their advice?

Answer: I have not received any "analysis" of AgResearch's Future Footprint from Business and Economic Research Ltd. I have however received a short document of six and a half

pages titled "Review economic basis of AgResearch FFP Business Case."

15238: Did he accept the advice given on 12 Dec 2012 that: "You may wish to ask what staff turnover is forecast, the basis for this estimate, and how the risk will be mitigated'?"

Answer: I can confirm I received this advice on 12 December 2012.

15239: Did he accept the advice given on 12 Dec 2012 that: "You may wish to ask what staff turnover is forecast, the basis for this estimate, and how the risk will be mitigated'?"

If so, what did AgResearch say in response; if not, will he?

Answer: I can confirm I received this advice on 12 December 2012.

15240: Did AgResearch respond to his letter referred to in para 49 of his memorandum for the cabinet economic growth and infrastructure committee; if so what did they say?

Answer: AgResearch did not respond specifically to that letter. Rather, communications have been ongoing.

15241: Did he receive information described in paragraph 4[a -e] of the memo of 3 September from Eileen Basher to Paul Stocks regarding the AgResearch future footprint; if so what is it, in full?

Answer: Yes. I have received a number of documents in relation to those matters, and may receive further information, over time.

15242: Did he receive information described in paragraph 5[a - b] of the memo of 3 September from Eileen Basher to Paul Stocks regarding the AgResearch future footprint; if so what is it, in full?

Answer: Yes. I have received a number of documents in relation to these matters, and may receive further information, over time.

Lodged: Friday 29th November 2013: DUE: 9/12/2013

To: Joyce: Science & Innovation

15588: With respect to his answer to WPQ 14641, on what date was approval to proceed with the Future Footprint Proposal sought and on what date was approval to proceed given?

Answer: AgResearch sought approval to proceed with the development of its Future Footprint proposal and consultation when the business case was submitted on 31 October 2012. Approval to proceed with the development of AgResearch's Future Footprint proposal and consult on it was granted on 16 April 2013.

(In light of his replies to WPQ 14642, 14643, and 14644 was the advice given on 20 December 2012 [paragraph 2] that 'The AgResearch Board is expected to obtain prior written consent from shareholding Ministers....' inaccurate; if not, would he explain how that advice and his answers to the above WPQs are consistent?

Answer: - This WPQ was not lodged – error in WPQ system).

15589: With respect to his answer 14646 has he received any written advice, not including any briefing by the Chair and Chief Executive of AgResearch, from officials regarding the

report of AgResearch's Change Management Team [CMT]; if so on what date or dates has that advice been received?

Answer: I have not received written advice from officials regarding the report of AgResearch's Change Management Team. Officials attended a meeting with AgResearch in which the report was discussed.

15590: With respect to his answer to WPQ 14647 on what days does his diary indicate a scheduled meeting with the Chair and/or the Chief Executive of AgResearch since 1 December 2012?

Answer: 31/01/2013 29/04/2013 29/07/2013 25/09/2013 31/10/2013 04/11/2013